APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/905,174	07/13/2001	Robert E. Dvorak	BLFR 1006-1	2749

22470	7590	07/05/2006

HAYNES BEFFEL & WOLFELD LLP
P O BOX 366
HALF MOON BAY, CA 94019

EXAMINER
VAN DOREN, BETH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3623	

DATE MAILED: 07/05/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

		Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary		09/905,174	DVORAK ET AL.
		Examiner	Art Unit	
		Beth Van Doren	3623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>21 April 2006</u>.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-26 and 57-64</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-26 and 57-64</u> is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>20060421</u>.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   The following Final office action is in response to communications received 04/21/2006.

Claims 1, 7-8, and 19-23 have been amended. Claims 57-64 have been added. Claims 1-26 and

57-64 are now pending and addressed below.

Response to Amendment

2.   Applicant's abstract submitted on 04/21/2006 is sufficient to overcome the specification

objections set forth in the previous office action.

3.   Examiner withdraws the drawing objections set forth in the previous office action.

4.   Applicant's amendment to claims 7, 8, and 19-23 are sufficient to overcome the 35

U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, rejections set forth in the previous office action.

Claim Objections

5.   Claims 60-61 and 63-64 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial

duplicate of claims 57-58. These claims are duplicates or else are so close in content that they

both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

6.   35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or
> any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and
> requirements of this title.

Claim 62 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to

non-statutory subject matter. Claim 62 recites "A machine readable memory impressed with

logic". The claim contains no recitation of a machine or that the computer program is part of a

computerized process where a computer executes the instructions set forth in the computer

program (i.e. executing in a computer readable medium). Claim 62, when taken as a whole, is

directed to a mere program listing, i.e. to only its description or expression. Thus, claim 62 is a

computer program by itself and, without the computer-readable medium needed to realize the

computer program's functionality, is considered nonstatutory functional descriptive material.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

7.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the
> subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

8.   Claim 59 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for

failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as

the invention.

Claim 59 recites "a computerized system". However, the body of claim 59 is directed to

"logic and resources". Therefore, it is unclear as to how the claim, as written, is a system since it

contains no hardware and/or software elements that constitute a system.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

9.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on
> sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

10.   Claims 1-15, 18-21, 23-26, 59, and 62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being

anticipated by Fields et al. (U.S. 5,459,656).

As per claim 1, Fields et al. teaches a computer-implemented method of adjusting

projected demand for one or more items at one or more locations, including:

calendaring one or more disruptive events with associated impact estimates to apply to

the items at the locations, wherein disruptive events have a start date and are either open-ended

or have a distant end date that is appropriately modeled by a step impact on sales history or

projected demand (See figure 2A, column 3, lines 4-12 and line 60-column 4, line 20 and 30-42,

column 7, lines 54-57, column 8, lines 11-20, wherein a disruptive event, such as a holiday, a

sale, etc., is calendared using impact estimates, where the impact of these events is shown on

models by altered demand curves. See column 9, lines 35-51. The calendaring is performed

using start dates. See also column 10, lines 10-15, which talk about location specific values in

the calendaring); and

applying the impact estimates (See column 2, lines 5-20, column 5, lines 1-7, and column

8, lines 1-20, wherein the impact estimates are applied to project demand or update historical

demand data), wherein

the impact estimates for disruptive events that already have taken place are applied to

sales history quantities used to project demand (See column 4, lines 60-67, column 8, lines 1-5,

column 9, lines 1-15, and column 10, lines 50-67, wherein the impact factors for the recent past

are used to update the sales history quantities), and

the impact estimates for disruptive events that have not yet take place are applied to

adjust the projected demand (See column 3, lines 54-66, column 4, lines 30-42, column 5, lines

1-7, and column 8, lines 10-30, wherein the impact factors for an event, such as a holiday, are

used to adjust demand from normally occurring days (i.e. the difference between a normal

Sunday and a promotional Sunday)).

As per claim 2, Fields et al. discloses wherein the impact estimates can be positive or negative (See column 6, lines 23-35 and column 11, lines 1-25, wherein the impact factors will increase or decrease the projections).

As per claim 3, Fields et al. teaches wherein the impact estimates are factors multiplied by the sales history quantities or the projected demand (See column 6, lines 15-32, column 7, lines 2-20, column 11, lines 1-25, and column 12, table 1, wherein the impact estimates are multiplied).

As per claim 4, Fields et al. discloses wherein the impact estimates are quantities added to the sales history quantities or the projected demand (See column 4, lines 1-14, column 6, lines 20-35, column 8, lines 20-32, wherein the impact estimates are quantities that are added to the historic sales date, such as adding ten percent to the sales history for the day after thanksgiving).

As per claim 5, Fields et al. teaches wherein the impact estimates for disruptive events that already have taken place are factors multiplied by the sales history quantities (See column 4, lines 1-5, column 7, lines 1-25, column 8, lines 20-32, column 11, lines 1-25, wherein impact estimates (percentages) are multiplied by the sales history quantities stored in the system).

As per claim 6, Fields et al. teaches wherein the impact estimates for disruptive events that already have taken place are quantities added to the sales history quantities (See column 4, lines 60-67, column 8, lines 1-5, column 9, lines 1-15, and column 10, lines 50-67, wherein the impact factors, interpreted through the recent actual demand, are combined with the sales history data stored in the database).

As per claim 7, Fields et al. discloses wherein calendaring involves assigning a particular disruptive event and the disruptive event's associated impact estimate to a particular start date

(See figure 2A, column 4, lines 5-20, and column 8, lines 11-20, wherein a disruptive event, such as a holiday, a sale, etc., is calendared to a specific date along with associated impact estimates).

As per claim 8, Fields et al. discloses wherein calendaring involves assigning a particular disruptive event and the disruptive event's associated impact estimate to a particular start date and time (See column 3, lines 60-67, column 4, lines 5-20 and 50-60, and column 8, lines 11-20, column 10, lines 15-30, which discloses the date and time of a disruptive event through the use of time intervals).

As per claim 9, Fields et al. teaches a plurality of disruptive events (See figure 2A, column 3, lines 4-10, column 4, lines 5-20 and 30-42, wherein a plurality of disruptive events are known in the system, such as a holiday, a sale, etc. Also, see column 3, line 60-column 4, line 15, wherein the disruptive event is broken up into time intervals per day, and therefore a plurality of disruptive events occur per day).

As per claim 10, Fields et al. teaches wherein one or more of the plurality of disruptive events have not yet taken place (See figure 2A, column 3, lines 54-66, column 4, lines 30-42, column 5, lines 1-7, and column 8, lines 10-30, wherein the disruptive event(s) have not yet taken place).

As per claim 11, Fields et al. teaches wherein one or more of the plurality of disruptive events have already taken place (See column 4, lines 60-67, column 8, lines 1-5, column 9, lines 1-15, and column 10, lines 50-67, which discusses data of the recent past for a disruptive event, such as a holiday or promotion).

As per claim 12, Fields et al. teaches wherein one or more of the plurality of disruptive events have not yet taken place and one or more of the plurality of disruptive events have already

taken place (See figure 2A, abstract, column 3, line 60-column 4, line 15, wherein the disruptive

event, such as a holiday, is broken up into time intervals per day. Therefore, the disruptive event

at morning interval A will have already occurred and the disruptive event at afternoon interval B

will not have already occurred).

As per claim 13, Fields et al. teaches wherein a plurality of impact estimates for the

plurality of disruptive events are combined multiplicatively (See column 3, lines 60-67, column

7, lines 2-20, column 8, lines 10-30, and column 10, lines 15-30, wherein the plurality of impact

estimates for the time intervals are scaled using multiplication. Also, the entire day projection

would be multiplied by a percentage, such as ten percent).

As per claim 14, Fields et al. teaches wherein a plurality of impact estimates for the

plurality of disruptive events are combined additively (See column 3, lines 60-67, and column

10, lines 15-30, wherein the plurality of impact estimates for the time intervals of the disruptive

event are added together to show projections for the entire day).

As per claim 15, Fields et al. teaches wherein a plurality of impact estimates for the

plurality of disruptive events are combined by a combination of addition and multiplication (See

column 3, lines 60-67, column 7, lines 2-20, column 8, lines 10-30, and column 10, lines 15-30,

wherein the plurality of impact estimates for the time intervals of the disruptive event are added

together to show projections for the entire day. Also, the entire day projection would be

multiplied by a percentage, such as ten percent. Multiplication is also used on each of the

intervals values).

As per claim 18, Fields et al. teaches applying a plurality of forecasting techniques to the

sales history quantities to derive a plurality of projected demand estimates (See column 6, lines

4-22 and 34-47, column 7, lines 30-48, column 10, lines 1-15, wherein a plurality of techniques as authored by the user would be applied to the sales history to derive a plurality of demand estimates).

As per claim 19, Fields et al. teaches applying a probabilistic forecast technique to the sales history quantities to derive the projected demand (See column 3, line 60-column 4, line 20, column 7, lines 2-25, column 8, lines 10-30 and line 55-column 9, line 15, wherein projections of probable demand are calculated using past sales history)

As per claim 20, Fields et al. teaches applying a segmented probabilistic forecast technique to the sales history quantities to derive the projected demand (See column 3, line 60-column 4, line 20, column 7, lines 2-25, column 8, lines 10-30 and line 55-column 9, line 15, wherein projections of probable demand are calculated using past sales history. The days are divided into segmented intervals, wherein each interval has a projection)

As per claim 23, Fields et al. teaches evaluating an actual impact of at least one particular disruptive event that has already taken place at least a predetermined period prior to adjustment of the projected demand, and adjusting the impact estimates based on the evaluated actual impact of the disruptive event (See column 4, lines 60-67, column 8, lines 1-5, column 9, lines 1-15, and column 10, lines 50-67, wherein the actual impact factors for the recent past are used to update the sales history quantities).

As per claim 24, Fields et al. teaches wherein the predetermined period is user selected (See column 4, lines 60-67, column 5, lines 1-6, 14-25, and 59-67, and column 6, lines 5-22, wherein the user authors the files, the files specifying the predetermined interval for updating the projected demand).

As per claim 25, Fields et al. teaches wherein the predetermined period is measured in days (See column 4, lines 60-67, column 5, lines 1-6, 14-25 and 59-67, and column 6, lines 5-22, wherein the predetermined period is weeks or days).

As per claim 26, Fields et al. teaches wherein the predetermined period is measured in time increment of less than a day (See column 4, lines 60-67, column 5, lines 1-6, 14-25 and 59-67, and column 6, lines 5-22, wherein the predetermined period is an interval of a day).

Claims 59 and 62 each recite equivalent limitations to claim 1 and are therefore rejected using the same art and rationale set forth above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

11.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

12.   Claims 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fields et al. (U.S. 5,459,656)

As per claims 16 and 17, Fields et al. teaches wherein a plurality of impact estimates for the plurality of disruptive events are applied (See figure 2A, column 3, lines 4-10, column 4, lines 5-20 and 30-42, wherein a plurality of disruptive events are known in the system, such as a holiday, a sale, etc. Also, see column 3, line 60-column 4, line 15, wherein the disruptive event is broken up into time intervals per day, and therefore a plurality of disruptive events occur per day).

However, Fields et al. does not expressly disclose the order that the impact estimates are applied, such as beginning with a most recent disruptive event or beginning with a most distant disruptive event.

Fields et al. discloses a system wherein disruptive events (holidays, sales, etc.) have impact estimates that are used to project sales for a given day. The system is able to store information concerning a plurality disruptive events by day and the system can also break a disruptive event into a plurality of intervals, each interval also reflecting a disruptive event. The user of the system defines how the user wants the impact estimates applied, such as starting on a certain date, at a specified interval, or at near future intervals. See column 5, lines 1-5 and 59-67, column 8, lines 10-32. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the impact estimates in any order specified by the user in order to make more appropriate and accurate projections by allowing the user to "author" what specifically the user needs projected. See column 2, lines 15-20, column 5, lines 14-25, of Fields et al.

13.   Claims 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fields et al. (U.S. 5,459,656) in view of Crosswhite (U.S. 6,611,726).

As per claim 21, Fields et al. applying forecasting techniques to the sales history quantities to derive the projected demand for businesses items (See column 3, line 60-column 4, line 20, column 7, lines 2-25, column 8, lines 10-30 and line 55-column 9, line 15, wherein projections of demand are calculated using past sales history). However, Fields et al. does not expressly disclose applying a regression forecast technique to the sales history quantities.

Crosswhite discloses applying a regression forecast technique to the sales history

quantities to predict future product demand from historical demand data (See column 3, lines 39-

67, which discusses regression techniques).

Both Fields et al. and Crosswhite disclose forecasting demand applying forecasting

techniques to historical demand data. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the

art at the time of the invention to use regression techniques to project demand in order to more

accurately forecast product demand from historical demand data by utilizing a time-series

forecasting method that uses data collected at evenly spaced intervals, such as the intervals

(periods in a day, days, weeks) of Fields et al. See column 3, lines 39-55, and column 4, lines 9-

15, of Crosswhite that discusses the technique and benefits of regression time series forecasting.

As per claim 22, Fields et al. applying forecasting techniques to the sales history

quantities to derive the projected demand (See column 3, line 60-column 4, line 20, column 7,

lines 2-25, column 8, lines 10-30 and line 55-column 9, line 15, wherein projections of demand

are calculated using past sales history). However, Fields et al. does not expressly disclose

applying an ARIMA forecast technique to the sales history quantities.

Crosswhite discloses using Autoregressive Integrated Moving Average (ARIMA)

methods to predict future product demand from historical demand data (See column 3, lines 39-

60, which discusses ARIMA).

Both Fields et al. and Crosswhite disclose forecasting demand applying forecasting

techniques to historical demand data. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the

art at the time of the invention to use ARIMA to project demand in order to more accurately

forecast product demand from historical demand data by utilizing a time-series forecasting

method that uses data collected at evenly spaced intervals, such as the intervals (periods in a day,

days, weeks) of Fields et al. See column 3, lines 39-55, and column 4, lines 9-15, of Crosswhite

that discusses the technique and benefits of ARIMA time series forecasting.

14.   Claims 57-58, 60-61, and 63-64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Fields et al. (U.S. 5,459,656) in view of Chavez et al. (U.S.6,684,193).

As per claim 57, Fields et al. teaches disruptive events with demand implications (See

figure 2A, column 3, lines 4-12 and line 60-column 4, line 20 and 30-42, column 7, lines 54-57,

column 8, lines 11-20, wherein a disruptive event, such as a holiday, a sale, etc., is calendared

using impact estimates, where the impact of these events is shown on models by altered demand

curves. See column 9, lines 35-51. The calendaring is performed using start dates. See also

column 10, lines 10-15, which talk about location specific values in the calendaring). However,

Fields et al. does not expressly disclose the disruptive event representing cannibalization of sales

or demand for a first item at a particular location by introducing a second item at the particular

location.

Chavez et al. discloses disruptive events representing cannibalization of sales or demand

for a first item at a particular location by introducing a second item (See column 3, lines 10-22,

column 6, lines 55-67, column 8, lines 5-30, wherein the competition between two products

causes a cannibalization of sales or demand).

However, Chavez et al. does not expressly disclose that the items are at the same

location.

Fields et al. discloses forecasting demand by applying forecasting techniques to historical

demand data. Fields et al accounts for events that will impact the estimates of sales. Chavez et

al. discloses competition between products causing cannibalization. Examiner points out that

whether the products are within one location or at multiple location does not change the

functionality of the competition claimed. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

the art at the time of the invention to include inter-item competition in the disruptive events of

Fields et al. in order to make more appropriate and accurate projections by including all

situations that impact demand. See column 2, lines 15-20, column 5, lines 14-25, of Fields et al.

See also column 3, lines 10-22, of Chavez et al.

As per claim 58, Fields et al. teaches disruptive events with demand implications based

on times and events (See figure 2A, column 3, lines 4-12 and line 60-column 4, line 20 and 30-

42, column 7, lines 54-57, column 8, lines 11-20, wherein a disruptive event, such as a holiday, a

sale, etc., is calendared using impact estimates, where the impact of these events is shown on

models by altered demand curves. See column 9, lines 35-51. The calendaring is performed

using start dates. See also column 10, lines 10-15, which talk about location specific values in

the calendaring). However, Fields et al. does not expressly disclose that the disruptive event

represents opening or closing of a competing store that impacts sales or demand at the location.

Chavez et al. discloses disruptive events including competing stores that impacts sales or

demand at the location (See column 3, lines 10-22, column 6, lines 55-67, column 8, lines 5-30,

wherein the competition exists between two products). However, Chavez et al. does not

expressly disclose that these locations are specifically being opened or closed.

Fields et al. discloses forecasting demand by applying forecasting techniques to historical demand data. Fields et al. specifically accounts for events that occur at specific starting times and will impact the estimates of sales. Chavez et al. discloses competition between products, the products at competing stores. It is well known in the art that stores open and close over time, and it is further well known in the marketing arts to consider competition within the market. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the competition of Chavez et al. in the disruptive events of Fields et al. in order to make more appropriate and accurate projections by including all situations that impact demand. See column 2, lines 15-20, column 5, lines 14-25, of Fields et al. See also column 3, lines 10-22, of Chavez et al.

Claims 60-61 and 63-64 are substantial duplicated of claims 57-58 and are therefore also rejected using the same art and rationale above.

Response to Arguments

15.   Applicant's arguments with regards to the rejections based on Fields et al. (U.S. 5,459,656) and Crosswhite (U.S. 6,611,726) have been fully considered, but they are not persuasive. In the remarks, Applicant argues that Fields et al. does not teach or suggest (1) open-ended disruptive events, (2) a step function, or (3) cannibalization of sales or demand by introduction of new items or opening/closing of competitive or complementary store.

In response to argument (1), Examiner points out that claim 1 recites "disruptive events have a start date and <u>are either</u> open-ended <u>or</u> have a distant end date". Therefore, Fields et al. teaches end dates, as explained above.

In response to argument (2), it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., step function) are not recited in the rejected claims. Examiner notes that by the current amendment applicant has added the language "step impact", however there is no recitation of a step function. As a note, on a cursory glance, Examiner did not see the term "step function" in the original presented specification.

In response to argument (3), Examiner notes that these limitations were been added in the current amendment and have been addressed above in the new art rejections, necessitated by amendment. Examiner notes that there is not recitation of complementary stores in the currently pending claims.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Phillips et al. (U.S. 2002/0116348) discloses determining demand for products and pricing the products based on the demand in the market.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Beth Van Doren whose telephone number is (571) 272-6737. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tariq Hafiz can be reached on (571) 272-6729. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

bvd
June 28, 2006

SUSANNA M. DIAZ
PRIMARY EXAMINER

AU 3623